United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,480	01/20/2006		Philippe Mutsaarts	1446 US/PCT	9917
Vesuvius	7590	01/11/2008	EXAMINER		
Attn: Robert S		KERNS, KEVIN P			
27 Noblestown Road Carnegie, PA 15106-1632				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1793	
			•		
				MAIL DATE '	DELIVERY MODE
				01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
·						
Office Action Summany	10/565,480	MUTSAARTS, PHILIPPE				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kevin P. Kerns	1793				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appreciate for Reply	ears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TE OF THIS COMMUN 16(a). In no event, however, may ill apply and will expire SIX (6) Mic cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 No	ovember 2007.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-34</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-34</u> is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>23 and 34</u> is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	n from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a) accepted or b) ⊠ drawing(s) be held in abey on is required if the drawir	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in ity documents have been (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application 				

Art Unit: 1793

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to because the term "Décision" in the last portion of the flowchart of Figure 1 should be corrected to be "Decision". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

Art Unit: 1793

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

In this instance, the phrase "The invention also relates to" is a phrase that can be implied and should be revised accordingly.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in the 10th line of paragraph [0005] of the substitute specification dated November 5, 2007, the "strikethrough" term "a" should be deleted before "radial wear". In the last line of paragraph [0012], the (patent) reference is not cited in an Information Disclosure Statement, and the application/patent number itself is believed to be in error, as the examiner cannot find any such document upon typing this patent number into the database. Correction of the application/patent number in paragraph [0012] and/or submission of this document in an Information Disclosure Statement are requested. In the 2nd line of paragraph [0015], replace "plates" with either "plate" or "plate's" before "history". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 23 and 34 are objected to because of the following informalities: in the 3rd line of claim 23, it is suggested to insert "said method" before "comprising" for clarity.

Art Unit: 1793

In the 9th line of claim 34, it is suggested to insert a comma after "variables" for clarity. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- Claims 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being 6. indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to independent claims 23 and 34, it is unclear what the limitation "whether to reuse or reject" distinctly embodies, as no process steps related to this limitation exist in claims 23-33, and no distinct apparatus structures related to this limitation exist in claim 34. In this instance, corresponding step(s) and structure(s) relating to reusing or rejecting are suggested to clarify this limitation.

Claim 23 recites the limitations "the flow" and "the pouring". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

With regard to independent claim 23, both instances of the term "them" in the 4th line of the claim are unclear, and it is suggested to replace "them" with "said parameters" for clarity.

Claim 24 recites the limitations "the valve cylinder end" and "the valve cylinder". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Art Unit: 1793

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the local conditions of use". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 26 recites the limitation "the instant determination". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "the same flow rate". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitations "the radial wear" and "the gate". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Claim 34 recites the limitations "the control", "the flow", "the pouring", "the results", and "the operations". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Response to Amendment

7. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed November 5, 2007 is sufficient to overcome the prior 35 USC 103(a) rejections of all claims of record.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 23-34 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 1793

Response to Arguments

9. The examiner acknowledges the applicant's amendment provided with the request for continued examination, a substitute specification, and a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132, all of which were received by the USPTO on November 5, 2007. Upon review, new objections to the drawings, abstract, specification, and claims, as well as new 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejections, are raised in above sections 1-6. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 overcomes the prior 35 USC 103(a) rejections (see above section 7). The applicant has cancelled claims 12-22, while adding new claims 23-34. Claims 23-34 are currently under consideration in the application, and all claims would be in condition for allowance if the 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph rejections would be overcome (see above section 8).

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Kevin P. Kerns whose telephone number is (571) 272-1178. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jonathan Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1793

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin P. Kerns Kerin Kerns 1/7/08 Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793

kpk

January 7, 2008